

## REMARKS

### INTRODUCTION

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 1, 3, 5, and 13 have been amended and new claim 24 has been added. No new matter is submitted.

Claims 1, 3-7, 13, 15, and 24 are pending and under consideration.

### DOUBLE PATENTING REJECTION

Claims 1, 3-7, 13 and 15 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-15 of Kim et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,961,647, in view of Chaiken et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,223,283. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

It is respectfully submitted that the outstanding obviousness-type double patenting rejection is improper for not meeting a prima facie obviousness standard, including identifying the particular claims relied upon, what features are missing from those particular claims, where those missing features can be found, and the underlying reason for modifying into those claim disclosures the missing features. The outstanding rejection only recites claims 1-15 of Kim et al. and states that in combination with Chaiken et al. the obvious combination would read on the claims, without identifying the particular claims relied upon or the underlying obviousness rationale for each claim, and thus fails to meet a prima facie obviousness standard and is improper.

In view of the following, it is further submitted that the outstanding obviousness-type rejection rationale is now not appropriate and the rejection moot.

Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

### REJECTION UNDER 35 USC §103

Claims 1, 3-7, 13 and 15 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,961,647, in view of Chaiken et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,223,283. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The outstanding Office Action has gone into substantial detail in an attempt to support why one skilled in the art would add EDID data to a memory within the MICOM controller

controlling power throughout the monitor in Kim et al. Within Kim et al., the MICOM controls power in the monitor.

Conversely, as clarified above, the claimed memory is separate from the claimed power control unit. As stated in the Office Action, the claimed control unit would be met by the MICOM. See page 8 of the Office Action. As only an example, see FIG. 3 of the present application and corresponding specification discussion.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the Office Action proposed combination fails to disclose all the claimed features.

Based upon the Office Action's extensive explanation regarding the MICOM and memory therein, it is further respectfully submitted that it would not have been obvious to modify Kim et al. to further have the Office Action relied upon memory separate from the MICOM and still operate as claimed. It is respectfully submitted that new claim 24 is allowable for at least similar reasons.

Withdrawal of this rejection and allowance of all pending claims is respectfully requested.

#### CONCLUSION

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: April 10, 2008

By: 

Stephen T. Boughner  
Registration No. 45,317

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501